UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/738,357	12/15/2003	Dan Jones	45098.00017.UTL1	8550

67670 7590 02/12/2008

West Corporation
c/o Michele Zarinelli
11808 Miracle Hills Drive
MSW11-Legal
Omaha, NE 68154

EXAMINER	
PESIN, BORIS M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/12/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mazarinelli@west.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/738,357	JONES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BORIS PESIN	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12,14,16-20 and 22-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12, 14, 16-20 and 22-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 10/31/2007. Claims 1-12, 14, 16-20 and 22-26 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 17, and 22 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 10/31/2007, Claims 1, 17, and 22 were amended. This action is made Non-Final.

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-12, 14,16, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Screen Dumps of Windows Media Player 9 used on Windows XP ("Windows") in view of Ludwig et al. (US 7185054).

For independent claim 1, Windows teaches a user interface on a display device for application sharing in a multimedia collaboration system (Fig. 1, 10), wherein the user interface, comprises:

a display region (Fig. 1, 10);

a taskbar region within the display region (Fig. 1, 11);

a desktop region within the display region (Fig. 1, 12);

one ore more control areas, displayed within the taskbar region, used to control the display region (Fig. 1, 13, and also see Figure 7 wherein after hitting the button (Windows Fig. 7, 70), the window (Windows Fig. 7, 14 small box window) is resized (Windows Fig. 8, 80)) within the desktop region (Windows Fig. 8, 12), thus the control area 13 is area is used to control what is displayed in the display region).

Windows does not specifically teach an interface wherein at least a portion of the desktop region can be shared by a local user of the user interface with a remote user in

a multimedia collaborative session, and no portion of the taskbar region is visible or accessible to the remote user. Ludwig teaches a portion of the desktop region can be shared by a local user of the user interface with a remote user in a multimedia collaborative session, and no portion of the taskbar region is visible or accessible to the remote user ("As described above in connection with collaborative workstation software, Snapshot Share ... is a utility used in multimedia calls and conferencing for capturing window or screen snapshots, sharing with one or more call or conference participants, and permitting group annotation, telepointing, and re-grabs." Column 29, Lines 6-11 also Column 4 Lines 58-67, "Selected regions"). Since a user is able to only share a window or selected regions, there is no portion of the taskbar that is visible or accessible. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Windows with the teachings of Ludwig and include a method of sharing desktop regions with the motivation to provide the user with a more effective and a less cost-effective collaboration system (See Ludwig Column 2, Lines 39-40).

As per claim 2, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein the taskbar region can be resized within the display region (Windows, Fig. 1, 11 and then resized in the display region in Fig. 2, 11a).

As per claim 3, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein the taskbar region can be closed (Windows Fig. 3).

As per claim 4, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein the taskbar region can be minimized (Windows Fig. 5 shows the taskbar already minimized. In order to get the taskbar minimized, a user would right-click on an unused

space on the taskbar (Windows Fig. 4, 41) and menu (Windows Fig. 4, 42) appears. After selecting *Properties* (Windows Fig. 4, 40), a window appears (Fig. 5, 52; *Taskbar and Start Menu Properties*). A user would select *Auto-hide the taskbar* (Windows Fig. 5, 50) and then hit *OK* (Windows Fig. 5, 51). The taskbar is then minimized and can be maximized when a user slides the mouse pointer all the way to the bottom of the display (Windows Fig. 5, 10)).

As per claim 5, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein the taskbar region can be relocated within the display region (Windows Fig. 1, 11 and then relocated within the display region in Fig. 2, 11a).

As per claim 6, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein the desktop region can be resized within the display region (Windows Fig. 1, 12 and then resized within the display region in Fig. 2, 12a).

As per claim 7, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein each control area in the task region (Windows Fig. 6, 13) includes a menu of control options (After a user hits button (Windows Fig. 6, 60), menu of control options appears (Windows Fig. 6, 61)).

As per claim 8, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein a configuration associated with the taskbar region can be changed (taskbar region's configuration was changed as seen first on the bottom (Windows Fig. 1, 11) of the display (Windows Fig. 1, 10) and then resized and relocated to the left (Windows Fig. 2, 11a) of the display (Windows Fig. 2, 10)), and wherein a configuration associated with the desktop region is automatically changed in response to a change in the

configuration of the task bar region (desktop region was automatically resized and relocated to maximize in the right side of the display (Windows Fig. 2, 12a) after the configuration change of the taskbar as described above).

As per claim 9, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim 8, wherein the change in the configuration associated with the task bar region includes a change of the position or a change of the size of the task bar region (taskbar region's configuration was changed as seen first on the bottom (Windows Fig. 1, 11) of the display (Fig. 1, 10) and then resized and relocated to the left (Windows Fig. 2, 11a) of the display (Windows Fig. 2, 10)).

As per claim 10, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim 8, wherein the change in the configuration associated with the display region includes a change of the position a change of the size of the display region (desktop region was automatically resized and relocated to maximize in the right side of the display (Windows Fig. 2, 12a) after the configuration change of the taskbar as described above).

As per claim 11, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim 2, wherein resizing the taskbar region (taskbar region's configuration was changed as seen first on the bottom (Windows Fig. 1, 11) of the display (Windows Fig. 1, 10) and then resized and relocated to the left (Windows Fig. 2, 11a) of the display (Windows Fig. 2, 10)) automatically resizes the desktop region to maximize the visible area of the desktop region within the display region without creating any overlap between the taskbar region and the desktop region (desktop region was automatically resized and relocated to maximize in the right side of the display (Windows Fig. 2, 12a) after the configuration

change of the taskbar as described above. Fig. 2 shows that the taskbar region (11a) and the desktop region (12a) still do not overlap).

As per claim 12, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein each application window (Windows Fig. 7, 14) can be resized (After hitting the button (Windows Fig. 7, 70), the window (Windows Fig. 7, 14) is resized (Windows Fig. 8, 80)) within the desktop region (Windows Fig. 8, 12).

As per claim 14, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein the taskbar region includes multiple control applications controllable by the local user via a menu of control options within the control areas (Windows Fig. 11, 13 and 110).

As per claim 16, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim 1, further comprising a plurality of task bar regions (Windows Fig. 2, 20-24).

As per claim 25, Windows-Ludwig teaches the user interface of claim of claim 1, wherein the display region is configured so that there is no overlap between any portion of the taskbar region and any portion of the desktop region (Windows Fig. 2, 20-24).

Claims 17-20, 22-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodgers et al. ("Rodgers", US PGPUB # 2002/0026478 A1) in view of Ludwig et al. (US 7185054).

For independent claim 17, Rodgers teaches a multimedia collaboration system for application sharing between a local multimedia device and a remote multimedia device (ABSTRACT), wherein the system comprises:

a local multimedia device (Fig. 3 and paragraph [0092]; *the computer of a first user (e.g., the first computer 110 in FIG. 1)*) including a sharer interface (Fig. 3; display of first computer has the sharer interface which is on the left), wherein the sharer interface comprises:

a sharer display region (Fig. 3; display of first computer which is on the left);

a sharer taskbar region within the sharer display region (Fig. 3, (144) and paragraph [0092]; *taskbar*);

a sharer desktop region within the sharer display region (Fig. 3, (140) and paragraph [0092]; *desktop*);

a sharer control area, displayed within the sharer taskbar region, used to control the display region (Fig. 3, (146) and paragraph [0092]; *a taskbar 144, which includes an icon 146 to initiate linked multi-user groups* and *The first user in this example initiates the formation of a linked multi-user group by moving his cursor 160 to the icon 146 and selecting the icon, which is associated with a drop-down menu, e.g., by clicking on it. In this embodiment, lists of users 150 and applications 152 which are available for participation in a linked multi-user group appear in the pull-down menu.;* Thus, the user's actions directly control the display region because pressing on button 146 causes the pull down menu to appear in the display region);

wherein there is no overlap between the taskbar region and desktop region within the display region (Fig. 3, (144) and (140));

a remote multimedia device configured to communicate with the local multimedia device, (Fig. 3 paragraph [0093]; *A second user (e.g., on the second computer 111 in*

FIG. 1)) the remote multimedia device including a viewer interface, wherein the viewer interface comprises:

a viewer display region (Fig. 3; display of second computer which is on the right);

a viewer desktop region also within the viewer display region (Fig. 3, (141) and paragraph [0093]; *desktop*).

Rodgers does not teach a system wherein at least a portion of the sharer desktop region can be viewed in the viewer display region, and no portion of the sharer taskbar region is shared with the remote device. Ludwig teaches a system wherein at least a portion of the sharer desktop region can be viewed in the viewer display region, and no portion of the sharer taskbar region is shared with the remote device ("As described above in connection with collaborative workstation software, Snapshot Share 514 shown in FIG. 30 is a utility used in multimedia calls and conferencing for capturing window or screen snapshots, sharing with one or more call or conference participants, and permitting group annotation, telepointing, and re-grabs." Column 29, Lines 6-11 also Column 4 Lines 58-67, "Selected regions"). Since a user is able to only share a window or selected regions, there is no portion of the taskbar that is visible or accessible. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Windows with the teachings of Ludwig and include a method of sharing desktop regions with the motivation to provide the user with a more effective and a less cost-effective collaboration system (See Ludwig Column 2, Lines 39-40).

As per claim 18, Rodgers-Ludwig teaches the multimedia collaboration system of claim 17, wherein the local multimedia device further comprises a sharer collaborative

application that can be activated through a sharer control option provided in the sharer control area of the sharer taskbar region (Fig. 3, (146) and paragraph [0092]; *a taskbar 144, which includes an icon 146 to initiate linked multi-user groups*).

As per claim 19, Rodgers-Ludwig teaches the multimedia collaboration system of claim 18, wherein the sharer collaborative application is configured to allow at least a portion of the sharer desktop region to be shared with the remote multimedia device, while preventing sharing of the sharer task bar region (paragraphs [0131] and [0132]; *it is the web browsers themselves (which are shared in a linked multi-user group) that transfer the copy of the web document from one of the web browsers to the other. This is conceptually illustrated in FIG. 7, wherein the web server 190 is shown as being directly coupled only to the web browser 192 on the first computer 110*).

As per claim 20, Rodgers-Ludwig teaches the multimedia collaboration system of claim 19, wherein at least a portion of the viewer desktop region corresponds to the portion of sharer desktop region that is being shared with the remote multimedia device (Fig. 8 and paragraphs [0131]-[0134]; *it is the web browsers themselves (which are shared in a linked multi-user group)*).

For independent claim 22, Rodgers teaches a method of application sharing between a local multimedia device and a remote multimedia device in a multimedia collaboration system (ABSTRACT), the method comprising:

allocating distinct areas on a sharer display interface of the local multimedia device (Fig. 3; display of first computer has the sharer interface which is on the left) for a sharer taskbar region and a sharer desktop region, so that there is no overlap

between any portion of the taskbar region and any portion of the desktop (Fig. 3, (144) and (140));

allocating an area on a viewer display interface of the remote multimedia device (Fig. 3; display of second computer has the viewer interface which is on the right) for a viewer desktop region (Fig. 3, (141) and paragraph [0093]; *desktop*); and

allocating one or more control areas, displayed within the sharer taskbar region, used to control the are on the viewer display interface (Fig. 3, (146) and paragraph [0092]; *a taskbar 144, which includes an icon 146 to initiate linked multi-user groups* and *The first user in this example initiates the formation of a linked multi-user group by moving his cursor 160 to the icon 146 and selecting the icon, which is associated with a drop-down menu, e.g., by clicking on it. In this embodiment, lists of users 150 and applications 152 which are available for participation in a linked multi-user group appear in the pull-down menu.;* Thus, the user's actions directly control the display region because pressing on button 146 causes the pull down menu to appear in the display region).

Rodgers does not teach sharing at least a portion of the sharer desktop region of the local multimedia device with the remote multimedia device, while preventing any portion of the taskbar region from being shared with the remote multimedia device. Ludwig teaches sharing at least a portion of the sharer desktop region of the local multimedia device with the remote multimedia device, while preventing any portion of the taskbar region from being shared with the remote multimedia device ("As described above in connection with collaborative workstation software, Snapshot Share 514

shown in FIG. 30 is a utility used in multimedia calls and conferencing for capturing window or screen snapshots, sharing with one or more call or conference participants, and permitting group annotation, telepointing, and re-grabs." Column 29, Lines 6-11, also Column 4 Lines 58-67, "Selected regions"). Since a user is able to only share a window or selected regions, there is no portion of the taskbar that is visible or accessible. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Windows with the teachings of Ludwig and include a method of sharing desktop regions with the motivation to provide the user with a more effective and a less cost-effective collaboration system (See Ludwig Column 2, Lines 39-40).

As per claim 23, Rodgers-Ludwig teaches the method of claim 22, wherein sharing at least a portion of the sharer desktop region comprises sharing with the remote multimedia device a window associated with an application running at the local multimedia device (Rodgers Fig. 8 and paragraphs [0131]-[0134]; *it is the web browsers themselves (which are shared in a linked multi-user group)*).

As per claim 24, Rodgers-Ludwig teaches the method of claim 22, further comprising changing a configuration associated with the sharer task bar region and automatically changing a configuration associated with the sharer desktop region in response to the change to the configuration associated with the sharer task bar region so that the sharer desktop region is maximized without obscuring any portion of the sharer taskbar region(Official Notice is given that changing the configuration associated with the task bar region in a Windows environment would automatically change the configuration associated with the desktop region and would not obstruct the taskbar

region.) One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have known that dragging the taskbar by the resize arrows would change the size (configuration) of the taskbar and thus change the size (configuration) of the desktop region. Rodgers teaches the sharer taskbar and desktop as the Windows environment (Fig. 3, (144); *Start* and paragraph [0071]). For further support, it is demonstrated above in the rejection for claim 8 how resizing the taskbar region in the Windows environment will automatically change the configuration of the desktop region).

As per claim 26, Rodgers-Ludwig teaches the multimedia collaboration system of claim 17, wherein the local multimedia device is configured so that there is no overlap between any portion of the sharer taskbar region and any portion of the sharer desktop region (See Rogers Figure 3, Elements 140 and 144).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/31/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to the Applicant's argument that Windows, Ludwig, and Rogers, alone or in combination do not teach one or more control areas, displayed within the taskbar region, used to control the display region, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. In the Windows reference, Figure 7 clearly illustrates that after hitting button 70, the small box window above the control area is resized (see Windows Fig. 8, 80)) within the desktop region (see Windows Fig. 8, 12), thus control area 13 is used to directly control what is displayed in the display region. Furthermore, there are other areas on the taskbar that

control other aspects of the control regions. For instance, one can clearly see a "show desktop icon" to the right of the Start button, which hides all open windows when activated. Since the Applicant has not made clear in the claims, nor specifically defined in the specification, what he means by "control the display region," the Examiner is interpreting displaying information on the display as controlling the display.

In regards to the Rogers reference, Rogers teaches, "The first user in this example initiates the formation of a linked multi-user group by moving his cursor 160 to the icon 146 and selecting the icon, which is associated with a drop-down menu, e.g., by clicking on it. In this embodiment, lists of users 150 and applications 152 which are available for participation in a linked multi-user group appear in the pull-down menu" (Paragraph 0092). Thus, the user's actions, with regards to the taskbar, directly control the display region because pressing on button 146 causes the pull down menu to appear in the display region.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BORIS PESIN whose telephone number is (571)272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Boris Pesin/
Examiner, Art Unit 2174